



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.              | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR     | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.    | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| 09/936,387                   | 12/18/2001  | John Montgomery Hamilton | 9013-38                | 2937             |
| 20792                        | 7590        | 02/16/2005               | EXAMINER               |                  |
| MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC |             |                          | VERBITSKY, GAIL KAPLAN |                  |
| PO BOX 37428                 |             |                          |                        |                  |
| RALEIGH, NC 27627            |             |                          | ART UNIT               | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                              |             |                          | 2859                   |                  |

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

09/936,387

**Applicant(s)**

HAMILTON ET AL.

**Examiner**

Gail Verbitsky

**Art Unit**

2859

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1-8 and 10-21.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: See Continuation Sheet.

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant argues that the device of Manske is not a reusable thermometer. This argument is not persuasive because the examiner uses Manske as a secondary reference only for its teaching of the particular liquid, while campbell, used as a primary reference discloses a thermometer that could be reused.

Applicant states that the examiner did not address Applicant argument with respect to Manske "Manske is not capable of exhibiting both the high and low temperatures teaches during a particular time" because this argument was not stated in the claims. Applicant's recitation starting with "wherein the indexes are moved ..." is not persuasive because the limitation stating "during a particular period of time period" has not been found in the claims. It is the claims that define the claimed invention, and it is claims, not specification that are anticipated or unpatentable. Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc., 7 USPQ2d 1064. Applicant states that there is no suggestion or motivation in Manske to combine. This argument is not persuasive because, Campbell discloses all the subject matter claimed by applicant in claim 1 with the exception of the particular liquid. Campbell does not teach away from mercury free liquid, Campbell does not rule out using a mercury free liquid. Campbell teaches a reusable thermometer. Therefore, using a mercury free liquid of Manske with the invention of Campbell does not contradicts Campbell. Also, there is no requirement that a motivation to make the modification be expressly articulated. the test for combining references is what the combination of disclosures taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art. In re McLaughlin, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Applicant's states that separating liquid of Manske is not capable of moving indexes. This argument is not persuasive, because the combination of Campbell and Manske does.

Bremer (U.S. 3726141) teaches in Fig. 3 a reusable max/ min thermometer comprising a first expandable fluid (expansion fluid, can be a gas) and a second visible transferable fluid (transfer fluid) 20, wherein the transfer fluid 20 can be a colored water (col. 3, line 40), and thus, not a mercury (mercury free) but inorganic compound (H<sub>2</sub>O) of low toxicity and low (relative to the expansion fluid) thermal expandability with a greater density with the expansion fluid 20.

GAIL VERBITSKY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER